



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,651	12/07/2000	Jerry Walter Malcolm	AUS9-2000-0655-US1	9971

7590 05/06/2004
Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Suite 2000
4627 N. Central Expressway
Dallas, TX 75205-4022

EXAMINER

BURGE, LONDRA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

5

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/731,651

Applicant(s)

MALCOLM ET AL.

Examiner

Londra C Burge

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application and IDS filed 12/7/2000.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus et al. (herein after Markus) U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601 B1 filed 1/15/1999, in view of Higley U.S. Patent No. 6,065,048 filed 10/29/1997 provided by the applicant.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Markus discloses *a method for filling out electronic forms* (Markus Col 6 Lines 39-40) *comprising: establishing a standard specifying pre-defined fields* (Markus Col 21 Lines 66-67); *providing a form made up of a plurality of subsets of said pre-defined fields* (Markus Col 22 Lines 6-9); *providing a database having a multiplicity of field values* (Markus Col 5 Lines 48-50); *providing a set of rules* (Markus Col 7 Line 13); *responsive to said rules, combining one or more field values and said pre-defined fields in a completed form.* (Markus Col 17 Lines 51-54, Col 22 Lines 6-9 and Col 17 Line 38).

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* that contains the fields. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7

Art Unit: 2178

Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 2, Markus discloses *responsive to application of a rule from said set of rules* (Markus Col 7 Line 13), *changing values in other related fields*. (Markus Col 11 Lines 65-67 i.e. adjust)

Markus does not specifically mention *selecting* a set of requested field values. However Higley mentions static documents, which are requested by the user (Higley Col 3 Lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of selecting static documents that have a new mobility as the sender desire as taught by Higley Col 3 Lines 40-44.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

Markus does not specifically mention a *network* for receiving the complaint form. However, Higley mentions a network for encoding, transmitting, receiving, and decoding information (Higley Col 3 Lines 9-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having a network to provide a new, useful and efficient manner of transmitting URLs over the internet so that the receiver of the URL can quickly and easily view the information corresponding to the URL as taught by Higley Col 3 Lines 11-19.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Markus discloses *transmitting said completed form in a network*. (Markus Col 8 Lines 5-8)

In regard to dependent claim 6, Markus discloses *displaying a set of requested field values for a requested field* (Markus Col 20 Lines 41-48); *and selecting one of said set of requested field values from the standard compliant database*.

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-

Art Unit: 2178

42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

Markus does not specifically mention *selecting* a set of requested field values. However Higley mentions static documents, which are requested by the user (Higley Col 3 Lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of selecting static documents that have a new mobility as the sender desire as taught by Higley Col 3 Lines 40-44.

In regard to dependent claim 7, Markus discloses *providing a set of rules responsive to flags* (Markus Col 7 Line 13 and Col 28 Lines 57-58 i.e. signals).

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 9, Markus discloses *transmitting said completed form to said requester*. (Markus Col 8 Lines 5-8 and Col 20 Lines 41-44)

In regard to dependent claim 10, Markus discloses *providing a flag in said form* (Markus Col 28 Lines 57-58 i.e. signals).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Markus discloses *determining whether a field value combined in said completed form is acceptable*. (Markus Col 11 Lines 64-67)

In regard to independent claim 12, Markus discloses *establishing a standard; having a predetermined set of fields*; (Markus Col 5 Lines 13-16 and Col 22 Line 6-9) *creating a database having a multiplicity of field values for filling out said fields* (Markus Col 5 Lines 48-50); *creating a set of rules* (Markus Col 7 Line 13); *and combining with a subset of said multiplicity of field values; wherein a completed form is created*. (Markus Col 17 Line 53 Col 5 Lines 48-50 and Col 17 Line 38)

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 13, Claim 13 reflects the same subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Claim 14 reflects the same subject matter as claimed in claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Claim 15 reflects the same subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale

In regard to dependent claim 17, Claim 17 reflects the same subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 18, Claim 18 reflects the same subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale

In regard to dependent claim 19, Markus discloses *displaying a set of requested field values for a requested field* (Markus Col 20 Line 41-44); *and changing at least one other field value associated with a field of said standard compliant form.* (Markus Col 11 Line 65-67 i.e. adjust)

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

Markus does not specifically mention *selecting* a set of requested field values. However Higley mentions static documents, which are requested by the user (Higley Col 3 Lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of selecting static documents that have a new mobility as the sender desire as taught by Higley Col 3 Lines 40-44.

Art Unit: 2178

In regard to dependent claim 20, Claim 20 reflects the similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11 and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 21, Markus discloses *receiving said completed form by a requester*. (Markus Col 8 Lines 2-5)

In regard to dependent claim 22, Markus discloses *a set of storage devices* (Markus Col 8 Lines 40-50 i.e. storage components) *including a standard compliant database having multiplicity of field values* (Markus Col 5 Lines 48-50); *and a controller coupled to said set of storage devices* (Markus Col 19 Lines 8 and 34-46) *for combining a subset of said multiplicity of field values with said received standard compliant form*. (Markus Col 17 Lines 38)

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 23, Markus discloses *a display device coupled to said controller*. (Markus Col 19 Lines 8 and 34-46)

In regard to dependent claim 24, Markus discloses *an input device coupled to said controller and to said display device for entering a value whereby different field values may be entered* (Markus Col 19 Lines 8 and 34-46).

Art Unit: 2178

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

In regard to dependent claim 25, Markus discloses *a set of rules* (Markus Col 7 Line 13) *for combining said subset of said multiplicity of field values with said standard compliant form*. (Markus Col 17 Line 53 and Col 22 Lines 6-9)

Markus does not specifically mention the *standard complaint form* from a requester. However, Higley mentions complaints that can be handled electronically (Higley Col 7 Lines 39-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Higley to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having complaint forms handled electronically which can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost of printed materials, and in a much faster manner than using the post office, courier, and all of the more familiar forms of information exchange and taught by Higley Col 7 Lines 39-47.

5. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus et al., in view of Higley provided by the applicant and in further view of Allen et al. (herein after Allen) U.S. Patent No. 6,026,761 files 2/10/1997 provided by the applicant.

In regard to dependent claim 8, Markus discloses *providing a set of rules to apply* (Markus Col 7 Line 13) *when conflicts arise among field values*.

Markus does not specifically mention conflicts that could arise. However, Allen mentions the possibility of a non-agreement (Allen Col 33 Lines 36-37) reached between a requester and a delegate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Allen to Markus, providing Markus the benefit of having the option of agreements and non-agreement which could result in the termination of a process if there is a conflict as taught by Allen Col 33 Lines 34-39.

In regard to dependent claim 16, Claim 16 reflects the similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Plow et al. U.S. 2003/0028792 A1 filed 8/2/2001

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Londra C Burge whose telephone number is 703-305-8784. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).*



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Londra C Burge
4/27/2004